DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 415 FL 027 853

AUTHOR	Frantzen, Diana
TITLE	Rethinking Foreign Language Literature: Towards an Integration of Literature and Language at All Levels.
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	23p.; In: SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues. Issues in Language Program Direction: A Series of Annual Volumes; see FL 027 849.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; Educational Research; Grammar; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Literature; Reading Skills; Second Language Instruction; Speech Skills; Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Researchers; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS	Collaborative Research

ABSTRACT

This article discusses ways that the instruction of literature might be altered in undergraduate language and literature courses alike. It considers a broad spectrum of possibilities that may inspire different attitudes about the use of literature in foreign language classes at all levels, discussing how students can learn to analyze the ways that certain grammatical choices affect meaning and arguing for the development of language skills--particularly reading, speaking, and writing--through advanced levels of study. It focuses on the following: the use of literature in lower-level and language-focused classes; the use of literature in advanced grammar and composition classes; the value of incorporating second language acquisition (SLA) research findings and language program techniques into literature classes; models for incorporating linguistic analysis of literature into classes at various levels of instruction; and common ground for curricular development and interdisciplinary collaborative research. (Contains 60 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 481 415

Rethinking Foreign Language Literature: Towards an Integration of Literature and Language at All Levels

Diana Frantzen
University of Wisconsin–Madison

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Ketchem

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

An artificial separation between language-focus and literature courses remains in place in many foreign language departments at universities across the country where literature is the domain of upper-level classes and overt language instruction is the domain of lower-level and advanced grammar and composition courses. Using the instruction of foreign language literature as the focal point, this article discusses ways that the instruction of literature might be altered in undergraduate language and literature courses alike. A broad spectrum of possibilities will be considered that may inspire different attitudes about the use of literature in foreign language classes at all levels. The hope is that the use of literature will not only provide contexts for meaningful classroom dialogues in beginning, intermediate, and advanced foreign language classrooms but will also foster communication and collaboration among diverse faculty, whose goals for their students are essentially the same: that they will learn to speak and write articulately, to appreciate the cultures that speak the languages that we teach, to function in the culture, to value the literature and the broader culture, etc.

The following issues that center on the instruction of literature will be addressed: (1) the use of literature in lower-level and language-focus classes; (2) the value of incorporating second language acquisition (SLA) research findings and language program techniques into literature classes; (3) models for incorporating linguistic analysis of literature into classes at various levels of instruction; and (4) the value of interdisciplinary collaborative research.

Using Literature in Lower-Level Foreign Language Classes

It is by now widely accepted that presenting and practicing grammatical structures and vocabulary within meaningful contexts in beginning- and intermediate-level foreign language (FL)[1] classes is

FL 027 853

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

important for language acquisition. Research has demonstrated that authentic reading materials,[2] in addition to their well recognized value as input, can serve as one type of meaningful context in which to practice and present structures and vocabulary. However, for the beginning level, and in some programs and textbooks even for the intermediate level, authentic texts tend to be journalistic readings and short realia items (advertisements, television guides, and the like), usually not literature.[3] This avoidance of literature is due, in part, to the fact that many feel that literature is best left for the higher levels of instruction. Lee (1986), for example, opposes the use of literature to develop reading skills for beginning learners and also questions its use in intermediate-level classes (p. 162). For those who prefer delaying its use, usually the belief is that the students are not linguistically sophisticated enough to handle literature until the advanced level, or perhaps the intermediate level. As Schofer (1990) points out, "although we pay lip service to literature as 'authentic,' we tend all too often to 'save' it for the more difficult levels and to treat it differently" (p. 327). Of late, however, some teachers and scholars have recognized the value of introducing literature at the lower levels of instruction, while acknowledging the challenges that using literature entails (Barnett 1991; Cheung 1995; Fountain 1996; Frantzen 1998; Knutson 1997; Lalande 1988; Rice 1991; Schofer 1990; Shanahan 1997). Rice (1991), for one, argues "that students can and should work with narratives and other literary forms from the earliest levels on" and "that students can work with these texts as literature, not just as examples of language usage" (p. 13).

Shook (1996) also sees benefits in using literature at the beginning level and provides a plan of attack for dealing with what have been seen as its problems:

> While there exist real problems in the introduction of literary works to the beginning FL learner-reader, there also exist real benefits to the beginning reader from such an introduction. Language teachers who inform themselves regarding such problems and benefits will be better equipped to promote to their beginning FL learner-readers not only literary reading but also reading in general (p. 204).

Significantly, he stresses that the key determiner of students' success is what the teacher asks the learners to do with the text. He provides specific suggestions for what an instructor might do to make use of the literature selection, including taking advantage of unfamiliar vocabulary by using it to practice valuable reading skills. He also provides suggestions for dealing with syntax and culture. According to Shook, "The potential difficulties of reading FL literature . . . can

become *opportunities for learning and expansion* not only for language but also for development of the learners' C2 [second culture] framework" (p. 206).

Shanahan (1997) finds additional benefits to the early introduction of literature. He argues that literature has "an important impact on developing communicative competence in the language learners" (p. 166) and that one of the values of literature is its emotional or affective impact on the reader. He contends that "we need to know much more about how to invoke the affective domain as an inducement to learning, especially with respect to the ways in which the affective loading inherent in language can be turned to the learners' advantage" (p. 168).

Clearly, all who promote the use of literature in beginning- and intermediate-level classes promote its judicious use, taking into account what the students can reasonably do, at the same time considering the level of difficulty of the texts. But a cautionary note about difficulty level is in order. Second language (L2) reading research findings indicate that the assumed difficulty of L2 reading material is often faulty (Allen, Edward, Bernhardt, Berry, and Demel 1988 [for secondary learners]; Lee and Musumeci 1988 [for college-level learners]). Although both Allen et al. and Lee and Musumeci investigated nonliterary texts, it is reasonable to assume that their findings would also be applicable to literature, an assumption supported by the findings of Fecteau (1999) who warns about making assumptions as to difficulty levels of literary texts. In her study involving students in an introduction to French literature class, she found:

> Even very similar texts by the same author make different demands on readers' knowledge and skills not only in the L2, but also in the L1. Despite controlling for as many text-based factors as possible, the complex interaction of text- and reader-based factors (including conceptual and linguistic knowledge) renders predictions of text accessibility and comprehension difficult (p. 485).

One factor that helps explain the difficulty of literature selections is that authors of works of literature do not write for an audience of L2 learners, but rather for compatriots, the majority of whom can be assumed to share most of the cultural and historical knowledge necessary to comprehend their work. Consequently, one of the main reasons that students of all levels find literature difficult is because they do not have the cultural and historical knowledge to be able to understand the text. Martin's (1993) questionnaire and interview results showed that students themselves recognize their own gaps in cultural knowledge and how these gaps make it difficult to understand literary texts. The intermediate-level French students in her study reported

that they lacked "the cultural background to enable them to relate to a foreign literature" (p. 205).

Instructors can help students overcome their linguistic and cultural shortcomings and thereby help them to understand the texts better. Shook (1997) provides suggestions for the types of exercises instructors might use for this purpose. He recommends the use of very specific tasks that beginning language learners can perform using various reading strategies (prereading, reading, and postreading) to help them fill in their linguistic and cultural gaps in understanding. He stresses the role of the instructor in presenting and practicing these techniques with their students:

> Since beginning foreign language readers do not share the necessary language and cultural background with the author to fully comprehend the text's linguistic and cultural information, instructors need to guide their students strategically in order to overcome this lack of shared background, assumed in literary texts, building from that which is known to that which is unknown (p. 238).

Kern (1995) also does not see as insurmountable the lacunae that FL students have when approaching a text written for native speakers, as his following observation indicates:

> Of course foreign language students often do not possess the relevant social and cultural background knowledge that would allow them to interpret a text in the same way as a native speaker might. But that does not invalidate their reading—it simply justifies the practice of comparing readings among classmates (and perhaps foreign peers) to become aware of the ways that culture, personal experience, and knowledge can influence textual interpretation (p. 72).

Widdowson (1988) even points out that there can be value in having students read a text without directly addressing the cultural associations contained therein:

> A language will obviously be exploited to meet the varying needs of those who use it and as it is it will acquire cultural associations in the minds of the users. But foreign language learners are remote from such associations, . . . and so they can take advantage of this detachment to relate the foreign language to their own familiar reality. You do not have to take the language and the culture together as a package deal (p. 18).

For presenting literature at the intermediate level, Davis (1989) presents a model for instructors to help them prepare materials for their students. In his model, questions are written for each segment of

the text that require the students to interact with the text; at the same time, the questions guide them into an understanding of narrative structure as well as linguistic features. He recommends that classroom activities similar to those presented in his model be used at regular intervals when introducing literature to intermediate students. The goal of this regular practice is to get students to apply the self-questioning technique eventually on their own and, in the process, become better readers.

The introduction of FL literature need not be postponed until the advanced level. Using some care in selecting texts and in preparing materials to help students access the texts, both linguistically and culturally, teachers can expose their students to poems, short stories, plays, and novels that will enhance their language learning experience. As Noricks (1986) argues, "studying literature at the intermediate level need not be a frustrating endeavor. In fact, it can be effectively utilized to increase students' control of oral and written Spanish and serve as an excellent point of departure for producing confident and competent language students" (p. 710). Noricks' argument applies to the beginning level as well, and, of course, to any foreign language.

Using Literature in Advanced Grammar and Composition Classes

Just as beginning- and intermediate-level FL classes can be enhanced by the introduction of literature, advanced grammar and composition classes can also be enriched by using short stories, poetry, and other forms of literature because they provide interesting topics for class discussion and writing assignments. They thereby give additional opportunities to practice speaking and writing in the target language, and to incorporate the structures and vocabulary being studied. They also are valuable because they provide meaningful contexts in which to examine grammatical structures for the important meaning they convey. This section will discuss several possibilities for using works of literature in advanced grammar classes.

Lunn (1985) provides one example of how literature can be used in advanced grammar classes for the purpose of leading students to an understanding of more sophisticated and subtle uses of the language. Lunn uses a "focus model" (citing Hopper and Thompson 1980; and Silva-Corvalán 1983) to classify differences in usage of the preterite and imperfect in Spanish. Lunn explains the choice of aspect "as a linguistic reflex of the cognitive ability to confer or withhold focus: preterite usage clusters around focus and imperfect usage around nonfocus" (p. 50). After explaining the focus model and discussing the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

conventional uses of preterite/imperfect in terms of this model, she discusses the way novelists may use the preterite and imperfect for unconventional uses and demonstrates this by using scenes extracted from several novels. One example she provides is a discussion of Juan Rulfo's use of the imperfect in *Pedro Páramo* to show the mental confusion exhibited by the title character.

Another example involves the use of poetry in Spanish classes to discuss nuances in meaning conveyed by the placement of descriptive adjectives relative to the nouns they describe. (Descriptive adjectives that follow their nouns generally serve to distinguish one noun in the class from another, as in *la casa blanca* [the white house], as opposed to a house of another color. One of the uses of preposed descriptive adjectives is to indicate a characteristic generally associated with that noun or to indicate what the speaker considers an inherent quality of the noun, as in *la blanca nieve* [the white snow].) This can be a rather dry discussion, so one method I have used to bring alive the point in advanced Spanish grammar and Spanish applied linguistics classes is to distribute a copy of a poem by Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz that is often referred to as *"Hombres necios"* [Foolish/Stupid Men], because that is how the poem begins.[4] After the students have read the poem, I address the issue of the type of information conveyed by adjective placement, asking the students to determine by the placement of the adjective in the phrase *hombres necios* whether the poem is criticizing all men or just a particular group of them. I find that the males in the class learn to appreciate the poem more after they realize that the postplacement suggests that the criticism is directed at men who are *necios*, not that all men are *necios*.[5] This type of discussion helps the students appreciate the fact that grammar really does carry meaning.

The discussion of the adjective placement employed in this poem can be expanded by considering the placement of the same adjective used later in the poem: *"Queréis, con presunción necia/hallar a la que buscáis"* [You want, with foolish arrogance/to find the one you are looking for]. Here the adjective follows the noun. One might, therefore, assume that it was the poet's desire to distinguish this type of arrogance from other types, rather than to suggest that foolishness is an inherent characteristic of arrogance (or of the particular arrogance described in this poem), which could be the interpretation had the adjective preceded the noun. Another explanation that can be considered is that a postposed adjective may carry more *semantic weight* than a preposed one (Bolinger 1972).[6] Still another factor must be considered, however: that of the issue of rhyme that comes into play here. Because of the rhyme scheme established in the poem, this line must rhyme with line 71 which ends with the word *Lucrecia*; consequently,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

placing the adjective *necia* before the noun would not work here. All of these points may lead to a sophisticated discussion of the poem's meaning as well as to a sophisticated discussion of grammar usage because of the inherently interesting context in which the grammatical element has appeared.[7]

If instructors of upper-level grammar/composition or linguistic courses wish to incorporate literature into their classes, they will most likely have to select the literature and prepare the exercises on their own because few grammar books used in advanced FL classes contain literature; those that do often do not contain language analysis exercises already prepared. Two exceptions for the advanced Spanish audience merit discussion.

In *Repase y escriba*, an advanced Spanish grammar and composition book by Dominicis and Reynolds (1994), each chapter's reading (about half of which are literature selections) is accompanied by an *Análisis* section that includes questions about the grammatical structures focused on in that chapter. For example, some exercises instruct students to find instances of certain usage in the text; other exercises ask students to notice or explain the effect caused by the author's use of a particular structure; others ask students to explain why a certain structure was used in a certain context. One example of this approach is an exercise that appears in the chapter where preterite and imperfect usage are reviewed. In the exercise, students are instructed to find instances in that chapter's story of particular preterite and imperfect usage (e.g., for preterite: beginning, end, or interrupted actions; for imperfect: customary actions, actions in progress, etc. [p. 17]).[8]

Lunn and DeCesaris's *Investigación de gramática* (1992) is an advanced Spanish grammar book whose approach provides a good example of how linguistic and literary analysis can complement one another. It covers in detail ten facets of Spanish grammar. At the end of each chapter, the grammatical features are discussed and students are asked to analyze them in the context of Spanish short stories. The seven short stories provided in the text are "revisited" for different grammar topics when the stories provide examples of the structure worthy of discussion and examination.[9]

As these examples have shown, students in advanced grammar classes would benefit by the inclusion of literature as sources of authentic contexts that can be used to present, discuss, analyze, and practice grammatical structures. If, as is commonly the case, the texts used for an advanced grammar class do not contain literature, instructors can use literature of their own preference and develop their own exercises for these purposes using the examples presented here as guidelines.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Incorporating SLA Research and Language Program Techniques into Literature Classes

Many researchers, including literature scholars themselves, have of late criticized the traditional approach to teaching literature in foreign language literature classes (e.g., Bernhardt 1995; Bretz 1990; Esplugas and Landwehr 1996; Friedman 1992; Kauffmann 1996; Kramsch 1985; Mittman 1999; Nance 1994; Swaffar, Arens, and Byrnes 1991). After reviewing research from the 1990s, Fecteau (1999) concludes, "there seems to be a consensus that the traditional 'transmission model' of literature teaching does little to foster direct engagement with the text or to develop students' literary competence" (p. 475). Students themselves seem to want this engagement, as Davis, Gorell, Kline, and Hsieh (1992) discovered when they investigated students' attitudes toward the study of literature.

One method of engaging students more directly with the text would be to employ techniques that give students more control over the material, something that has occurred at lower levels of instruction. Much SLA research during the last two decades has underscored the importance of incorporating reading skills development in beginning- and intermediate-level foreign language classes. This research has made its way into textbooks for these levels to such a degree that a publisher would not attempt to market a beginning or intermediate FL text if reading strategies exercises did not accompany its reading selections. However, reading strategies exercises have been slow to make their way into literature anthologies directed at the advanced level, perhaps because of cost or because it is assumed that students who take introduction to literature classes are too advanced to need this type of assistance.[10]

These staples of the teaching of FL reading at the lower and intermediate levels should not be overlooked at the advanced level; these types of exercises are also important at the "advanced" level because, despite the label, the language competence of the majority of the students in these classes is not really advanced, and they need guidance to help them extract meaning from the literature they now read (Bernhardt 1995; Bretz 1990; Bretz and Persin 1987; Fecteau 1999; Knutson 1997; Nance 1994). Literature tends to differ considerably from the expository texts and straightforward literary narratives that students are used to reading at lower levels of instruction. As Knutson (1997) notes, "the value of prereading work in terms of both comprehension and interest does not diminish at the advanced level" (p. 54). Bretz and Persin (1987) also stress the importance of prereading exercises for introduction to literature classes. They recommend that teachers of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

literature develop "prereading exercises through which students are trained to guess about unfamiliar items, make relevant inferences, articulate their own knowledge concerning literary and linguistic conventions, and generally use context in combination with personal knowledge" (p. 168).[11] Others have also recommended the use of prereading exercises in literature classes (e.g., Bretz 1990; Harper 1988; Kauffmann 1996; Keller 1997; Mujica 1997).

Fecteau (1999) stresses the fact that "even students with apparently strong FL skills are apt to miscomprehend when reading literary texts in their L2 because of the greater demands placed on lexical and syntactic knowledge" (p. 489). Her study demonstrates that, in addition to insufficient lexical and syntactic knowledge, many other factors are responsible for learners' inability to comprehend a literary text: gaps in cultural and historical background, ignorance of literary concepts, and the inability to use textual cues. She reports, "The present findings suggest that certain literary features[12] are not apparent to college students in their L1 or L2, whether because they lack background knowledge or cannot activate it, do not focus on key textual cues or perhaps miscomprehend them, or because these elements are not equally apparent in all texts" (p. 489).

Mittman (1999) discusses a model that she has used for a third-year German literature course that includes the use of a variety of authentic reading (including literature), listening, and viewing materials whose goals are "increasing students' cultural knowledge, critical reading skills, and linguistic fluency" (p. 480). A variety of lexical, syntactic, and stylistic patterns contained in the readings (excerpts from legal documents, poetry, magazine and newspaper articles) is used to help develop the students' language skills. She explains that "by directing the students' attention directly at the language of a given text, they not only gain a sense of empowerment over difficult passages, but also find yet another point of access to the fabric of the culture . . . Thus, the lack of linguistic systematicity in the texts can, if dealt with consciously, itself be a tool to help students overcome their inhibitions and gain a sense of their ability as decoders of texts" (p. 485).

Because most texts written for introductory foreign language literature courses have not incorporated many reading strategies exercises,[13] the responsibility lies with instructors to assess the needs of their students and to prepare appropriate exercises. Prereading exercises can be oral or written but in either case are an effective method of incorporating language practice into literature classes while also helping learners better to comprehend the text.

Those of us who teach advanced-level classes must take into account the fact that students cannot reach very high levels of proficiency

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in the standard two-year university program without also spending extensive time abroad in the target language country. Even students in optimal programs, such as intensive training programs, must have significantly more hours of instruction than students receive in the first few years of language study to acquire high levels of proficiency. Omaggio Hadley (1993), stresses this fact when discussing the amount of time the Foreign Service Institute expects its students to take to reach various levels of proficiency:

> If it typically takes 720 hours of instruction under the rather ideal conditions of intensive study at the Foreign Service Institute for an adult with high aptitude to become proficient at the Superior level in French or Spanish, it is difficult to expect students in a four-year high school program or a four-semester college sequence to reach that same level of competence after 200 or 300 hours (p. 27).

Skills development, a mainstay of the lower level language program, has not typically been a major component of foreign language literature classes. Several researchers have expressed concern that upper-level literature-focus classes do not typically afford students many opportunities to practice speaking (e.g., Bernhardt 1995; Bretz 1990; Esplugas and Landwehr 1996; Friedman 1992; Kauffmann 1996; Kramsch 1985; Mujica 1997; Nance 1994; Schofer 1990; Swaffar, Arens, and Byrnes 1991). Kramsch (1985), for example, presents "a continuing plea for engaging students in the negotiating of meaning in spoken and written discourse. The strategies they learn from oral communication can be put to use for the interpretation, discussion, and personal understanding of literary texts within the group interaction of the classroom" (p. 364). She contends that "the discourse between a literary text and its readers and among readers of the same text can serve as the link between communicative language teaching and the teaching of literature" (p. 364).

Mujica (1997) agrees and, pointing to the fact that most students who take introduction to literature courses are not fluent in the language, she states that "in order to ensure that the survey course[14] remains an integral part of the students' language-learning experience, instructors need to incorporate strategies for developing speaking as well as reading competence. Even when the textbook provides a pedagogical apparatus, it is still up to instructors to integrate oral production into their courses" (p. 211). Others have pointed out the lack of attention to "language needs" in introductory literature classes (e.g., Graman 1986; James 1996; Schofer 1990; Vogely 1997). James (1996) states that "teachers of literature and of literary criticism have to be prepared to see themselves as teachers of language at the higher levels, and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

universities have to recognize in their reward structures the investment of time that this involves" (p. 26). She further argues that "in order to teach skills and content successfully at a very high level, you have to learn a lot about your students' actual skills, and you have to be prepared to work intensively with them on improving these skills" (p. 27).

Writing is one of the skills that would benefit from more intensive work. The writing skills of FL students would improve if courses at all levels, including those that focus on literature, required students to write multiple drafts of their compositions, a practice which composition texts, both for English L1 and for L2 composition classes, have promoted for years. This is called *process writing* as opposed to *product writing*, which requires only one draft. Process writing involves several steps on the way to the final paper: prewriting exercises, work on separate components (e.g., the thesis statement, the introductory paragraph, etc.), the use of several drafts, and in some models, the incorporation of peer editing as a component. Kauffmann (1996) asks the question: "Why do we have students write a long term paper due the last week of the semester, after it is too late to interact with their thought processes?" (p. 400). Instead of this approach, she recommends that process writing be used in literature classes, in part to help address the problems that may result from the disparate skills and backgrounds of students in the introduction to literature classes (see also Mittman 1999). As professors of composition and literature classes who have incorporated this approach realize, the various steps of process writing—if carried out appropriately—can guide students into becoming better writers, and are more effective than simply assigning one-draft compositions. The feedback that students receive in the one-draft arrangement is limited to the content and structural comments that the instructor gives on each one of these assignments. The chances for improved writing would increase if more than one draft were allowed so that the intermediary feedback would help guide the students into expressing themselves more clearly.

As for other ways to make writing skills a more central component of literature classes, Kramsch (1985) and Cheung (1995) are among those who recommend that students in some way reconstruct a text in writing exercises in order to help them better understand linguistic features such as style, register, syntax, etc. As Kramsch explains it, "The very reconstruction of the text by the students makes apparent to them better than any analysis by a teacher some of its stylistic features" (p. 363). Kramsch (1985), Cheung (1995), Kauffmann (1996), and Esplugas and Landwehr (1996) all provide models.

While it is true that not all faculty who teach literature employ a lecture-only format, when it is the dominant approach, it is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

unfortunate because the subject matter taught in these courses lends itself so readily to the active development of the oral and written skills. Clearly, many students in introductory foreign language literature classes would benefit from the use of techniques practiced in lower-level classes. Their comprehension of the texts would improve from the continued use of reading strategies exercises, now applied to literature selections, and their language skills would improve if provided more opportunities to interact with the text and the teacher, both orally and in writing.

Incorporating Linguistic Analysis into Literature Classes

Foreign language literature classes can also be enriched by incorporating discussions of authors' use of particular structures, vocabulary, or sociolinguistic features to convey their ideas. Students in these classes would benefit from overt analysis of linguistic features used by authors in composing their works. According to Cheung (1995):

> Any attempt at literary interpretation must begin with an investigation of the grammar of the literary text, its structures and patterns, and their interrelationships. These linguistic features are in fact products of the natural grammar of the language, which needs to be analyzed explicitly if the meaning of the text is to be explained in all its complexity, not just intuited or described. Comprehension of the text is possible only with proper linguistic knowledge (p. 99).

He further contends that "linguistic analysis is a field in which literature students need just as much basic training as language students" (p. 99). One of the reasons that Cheung encourages students to analyze grammatical structures used by authors is because "linguistic analysis may be regarded as retracing the creative process of writing. Students who participate in this retracing have an opportunity to vicariously experience the act of writing the text themselves; their understanding of its structure, themes, and language is often more profound and revealing than what can be achieved in the traditional lecture format" (p. 101).

Vogely (1997) also encourages students in FL literature classes to examine linguistic features as they relate to the meaning conveyed in the work. She argues that "time can be dedicated to identification and function of linguistic elements, such as object nouns and pronouns and their antecedents. Attention should be given to the use of verb moods and tenses, and how they impact the development of the text" (p. 247).

At this juncture, it is important to point out what a linguistic analysis should not be. Some professors of literature may be concerned that the use of literature in an SLA context will focus not on the aesthetic reading itself but on reading as a springboard to a discussion far removed from the text. This is a legitimate concern. Indeed, if the class discussion becomes a discussion of grammar usage with very little impact in the work, it will lose most of its value and, in all likelihood, will end up being counterproductive. The guiding principle should be to discuss items that play an important role in the conveyance of meaning, in párticular items where the author seems to have made a deliberate choice.

An example from Spanish will illustrate this point. In Spanish (as well as in many other languages, such as Bulgarian, French, Russian, etc.), separate verb forms are used to indicate differences in social status and differences in degrees of intimacy between interlocutors. By the advanced level, most students of Spanish are aware that a father would use the *tú* [you-familiar] forms when talking to his son. Consequently, the occurrence of these verb forms in a story containing dialog between father and son would not normally be an important point of discussion at advanced levels of instruction. But when a deviation from expected usage occurs, this would be an important linguistic insight to discuss or have students discover. Juan Rulfo's short story "No oyes ladrar los perros" [You Don't Hear the Dogs Barking] provides a good example. The story is written primarily in dialog form with most of the plot emerging from the conversation between a father and his adult son. At the beginning of the story, as the father carries his gravely wounded son to a town where he hopes to get him medical help, the father addresses his son using the *tú* verb forms, which is to be expected. However, at one point in the story, the father begins using the formal *usted* forms. While reading the story, most third- or fourth-year learners probably do not even notice this switch, something that would be immediately apparent to most native speakers. But if encouraged to find the place where the more formal language is used, students will find it, and if instructed to consider what the father is saying at the place where he uses the more formal language, students may discover that it is at the point when the father is discussing his disappointment with the bad life that his son has lead. If asked to explain why he is doing this, the students may realize that it is to show a psychological distance: that this is one way to demonstrate linguistically the distance he feels on an emotional level.

Linguistic analysis need not be limited to grammatical features of the language. It can involve any language usage or language-related devices that the author has used to construct the work. Jordan (1999)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

provides a pragmalinguistic analysis of the role played by dialogue in literature, such as the effect of immediacy that dialogue creates; in addition, she shows how the use of dialogue is a linguistically more economic form of communication than narrative, which is especially important for the short story because of its short duration (p. 217).

All the examples discussed previously in the section titled "Using Literature in Advanced Grammar and Composition Classes" apply for the literature classes as well. One additional example for incorporating linguistic analysis into literature classes will be discussed in the next section.

Common Ground for Curricular Development and Interdisciplinary Collaborative Research

How literature should be taught in foreign language programs has been a central issue in discussions of curricular changes for the last two decades, as attested by the numerous citations in this article. The value of incorporating literature instruction at the earliest levels of language study is as clear as is the need to modify the instruction of literature at all levels in many classrooms. Henning (1993) advocates a full integration of literature into the curriculum: "Through literature, students can develop a full range of linguistic and cognitive skills, cultural knowledge, and sensitivity" (p. 53). As has been shown, many areas of common concern really unite us. Graman (1986) underscores this fact discussing the common ground between teaching language and literature and literature theory:

> The point here is that cognitive development, including the critical abilities teachers wish to foster, are the same abilities sought by the language instructor at all levels of language development. Linguistic abilities are needed to express developing ideas. Linguistic and cognitive structures in turn provide the bases for further development. Therefore, while the language teacher's primary goal is second language acquisition, and the literature teacher's the development of critical skills needed for the perception and understanding of literary forms and meaning, both rely on the same constructive and cognitive process, and are therefore accommodating related aspects of the same learning entity (p. 178).

Swaffar (1988) echoes these sentiments, also stressing the common ground that should unite our various disciplines:

> Just as literary criticism, L2 reading research in the past decade has stressed the society's or the reader's meaning options rather than

> those of the text or of an "informed" professor. We have some things to talk about with our colleagues in literature and language studies. In view of our shared premises about meaning and the reader role, language departments now have opportunities for coherent programming and teaching practices between levels: The earlier use of authentic texts in the elementary program, the broader definition of literature to include cultural and historical readings in elementary as well as advanced work, the shared concern for developing metacognitive interpretive abilities, can result in integrated curriculum planning. Our "language" and "content" schism within the department can be addressed (p. 141).

Many, like Swaffar, have identified the need for a clear articulation between levels and against the artificial language/literature dichotomy (e.g., Barnett 1991; James 1996; Kern 1995; Kramsch 1985; Ruiz-Funes 1999; Shook 1996, 1997; Swaffar 1988; Swaffar, Arens, and Byrnes 1991).

One way to help bridge the divide is through collaborative research in which the authors' areas of expertise in different fields can complement one another's. One area of investigation discussed above involves the examination of the ways authors use linguistic elements to convey meaning in their works. As Cheung (1995) contends, "Successful reading, therefore, requires not only an ability to identify what each linguistic constituent, semantic entity, or grammatical unit, denotes in the immediate textual environment; it also needs a thorough understanding of how these constituents contrast with other possible choices available in the linguistic code" (p. 99).

An excellent example of Cheung's point as well as of the benefits of interdisciplinary research can be found in the work of Lunn and Albrecht (1997) who argue for the use of examination of "grammar as a tool for understanding texts, and against the curricular separation of grammar and literature" (p. 227). Lunn and Albrecht combined their expertise in linguistics and literature, respectively, to demonstrate how Julio Cortázar's use of language (structure as well as lexicon) in his popular short story "Continuidad de los parques" is responsible in large part for the meaning that the story conveys. The authors point out that although this story is popular in intermediate-level texts because of its short length and its "modest" vocabulary, it is not an easy story to understand, and students essentially miss the point at the end. For that reason, they recommend that the text be presented in terms of its preterite/imperfect usage because, "when the story is taught as an example of . . . how the meanings of preterite and imperfect can be manipulated, it is rendered both comprehensible and accessible"

(p. 232). Their analysis of Cortázar's use of aspect (preterite/imperfect) "reveals that its aspectual structure is parallel to [the story's] narrative structure" (p. 227); they note that "the linguistic structure of the story is mimetic to its narrative structure, with the result that the impact of the whole is enhanced" (p. 228). Tracing Cortázar's use of preterite and imperfect, they show how the story can be divided into four parts: they note that "what happens in each of the first three parts of the story corresponds to distinct and describable uses of verb morphology; i.e., the content of the story is mirrored in the verb forms that are used to tell it" (p. 230). The fourth part—the last three sentences of the story—is marked by the absence of verbs. Lunn and Albrecht explain the lack of verbs in the last part as follows: "The morphological categories of person and tense have thus been eliminated, with the result that the end of the story is *literally* impersonal and atemporal: the violation of reality described in the story is not specific to any person or time" (p. 230). In addition to the preterite/imperfect analysis, Lunn and Albrecht analyze other grammatical structures in the story and give several examples of exercises that teachers can provide their students to help them discover on their own the meaning of the story that is revealed by a grammatical analysis. This technique has the benefit of demonstrating to learners that "all grammatical choices have meaningful consequences" (p. 232).

The collaboration of these two researchers has resulted in a type of analysis that can benefit FL students, regardless of whether they are in a course whose focus is on literature or in one whose focus is on grammar. Both types of courses would benefit from such an overlap. As Schofer (1990) argues, "efforts should be made to bring language and literature teachers together as research teams, as participants in nationally sponsored workshops, and on panels at regional and national conventions" (p. 333). Collaboration at all levels and across the separate fields of language instruction, literature, linguistics, and language pedagogy is valuable, not only for curriculum development, but also for gaining an appreciation of each other's fields.

Conclusion

This paper joins many others in encouraging a reassessment of the way we, as departments and as individuals, teach our various courses, and, in particular, a reassessment of how and even whether we teach literature. Many teachers and scholars point to the value of literature for its affective, cultural, linguistic, and critical thinking value, all of which matter at all levels of instruction. Schofer (1990), for example, argues that "today language and literature teachers are in a strong

position to integrate literature into the core of language teaching, to the benefit of both language and literature instruction" (p. 326). Works of literature not only provide meaningful contexts for presenting and practicing grammatical structures in language classes, they also provide examples of structures that can be analyzed at more advanced levels for the meaning they convey.

There are many areas of common ground and common interests among the diverse disciplines that make up university foreign language and second language departments. Many of us are calling for an end to the artificial divisions that have developed over the years. In her provocative article of a decade ago, titled "Language and Literature: False Dichotomies, Real Allies," Marva Barnett (1991) gave a "clarion call for parity among language, literature, and cultural studies" (p. 9). She argued that "as professionals specializing in different aspects of language, culture, and literature study, we *must* talk to one another, articulating our programs not only in individual departments but also across institutions, from the earliest language study to the most advanced literary pursuits" (p. 10). If we can retreat from the domains that have developed over recent decades and incorporate relevant elements from one another's content areas, approaches, and research, the artificial separation that has developed between language and literature courses can be diminished and we, as well as our students, will be the beneficiaries.

Notes

1. The terms foreign language (FL) and second language (L2) are used interchangeably in this article.
2. "Authentic" texts are defined as those that were written for native speakers.
3. Two noteworthy exceptions are: (a) the first-year college French textbook, *Paroles*, by Magnan, Ozzello, Martin-Berg, and Berg (1999); and (b) the first-year college Spanish textbook, *Dicho y hecho*, by Dawson and Dawson (2001). Both texts include prereading exercises to help students better understand the literary works.
4. Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz (1648–1695) was a Mexican nun whose poetry, including the poem treated here, is commonly presented in introduction to literature courses. This poem criticizes men for their contradictory behavior: on the one hand, for encouraging woman into bad behavior and then attacking them afterwards for doing precisely what they had encouraged them to do and, on the other hand, also for criticizing the women who do not comply. The poem is widely available; one source is an anthology by Garganigo, De Costa, Heller, Luiselli, Sabat de Rivers, and Sklodowska (1997).

5. Because this is poetry and not prose, the issue of poetic license must also be considered. Indeed, it may not have been the poet's intent to suggest by her use of adjective placement that the poem was addressing a subgroup of men rather than all men. Sor Juana may have placed the adjective after the noun here for other reasons. For example, by beginning the poem with a noun rather than with an adjective makes the poem's beginning more powerful; in addition, the first word being *hombre* focuses the reader's attention on men, not on the attribute. Nevertheless, because the adjective was postposed, it allows the possibility that this poem's criticism is directed at a particular group of men and not at men in general.
6. Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin (1965) use the term "relative informativeness" for this characteristic (1965, p. 89).
7. Others see the value of using literature in linguistics classes. For example, Álvarez (2000) advocates using excerpts from literary texts to teach or present examples of linguistic variation. She suggests the use of novels to examine the ways authors display differences in dialect, register, pronunciation, and other linguistic variation.
8. *El próximo paso* by Bárbara Mujica (1996) is another advanced Spanish grammar and composition text that contains literature (one story per chapter). Although the analysis exercises that accompany the literature selections in this text do occasionally ask questions that involve the grammar focus of the chapter, they generally do not.
9. This type of analysis could supplement intermediate-level language courses as well as advanced-level courses in applied linguistics or literature.
10. It has been suggested that incorporating methods such as those discussed here into literature classes may help to retain students in FL language programs (e.g., Bretz and Persin 1987).
11. Bretz and Persin (1987) describe a model for a teacher preparation course that was designed to train FL instructors to make literature more accessible to their students. Their focus was to train teachers so that they could use various approaches to literature "to involve students actively in the interpretation and enjoyment of literary texts, and by extension, to help students to perceive literature's place within a larger cultural context" (p. 167).
12. Some of the "certain literary features" discussed by Fecteau (1999) are tone, author's aim, and narrative structure.
13. Mujica (1997) states: "Most Spanish anthologies now offer an up-to-date selection of authors, as well as a variety of pedagogical aids" (p. 211). However, in the recent anthologies I have examined, I have not found there to be many pedagogical aids; those included are not very elaborate.
14. Mujica uses the term "survey course" as follows: "The survey is usually the first literature course that undergraduates take" (p. 211).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Works Cited

Allen, Edward D., Elizabeth B. Bernhardt, Mary Therese Berry, and Marjorie Demel. 1988. Comprehension and Text Genre: An Analysis of Secondary School Foreign Language Readers. *Modern Language Journal* 72: 163–72.

Álvarez, Isabel. 2000. Las novelas que hablan: ¿Es posible enseñar lingüística tomando como base textos literarios? Paper presented at the Mid American Conference on Hispanic Literature, Madison, WI.

Barnett, Marva A. 1991. Language and Literature: False Dichotomies, Real Allies. *ADFL Bulletin* 22(3): 7–11.

Bernhardt, Elizabeth B. 1995. Teaching Literature or Teaching Students? *ADFL Bulletin* 26(2): 5–6.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1972. Adjective Position Again. *Hispania* 55: 91–94.

Bretz, Mary Lee. 1990. Reaction: Literature and Communicative Competence: A Springboard for the Development of Critical Thinking and Aesthetic Appreciation. *Foreign Language Annals* 23: 335–38.

Bretz, Mary Lee, and Margaret Persin. 1987. The Application of Critical Theory to Literature at the Introductory Level: A Working Model for Teacher Preparation. *Modern Language Journal* 71: 165–70.

Cheung, Samuel Hung-nin. 1995. Poetics to Pedagogy: The Imagist Power of Language. In *Redefining the Boundaries of Language Study*, edited by Claire Kramsch, 99–122. AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Cortázar, Julio. 1968. Continuidad de los parques. *Ceremonias*. Barcelona: Seix Barral.

Cruz, Sor Juana Inés de la. 1997. Redondillas. In *Huellas de las literaturas hispanoamericanas*, edited by John Garganigo, René de Costa, Ben Heller, Alessandra Luiselli, Georgina Sabat de Rivers, and Elzbieta Sklodowska, 140–42. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Davis, James N. 1989. *The Act of Reading* in the Foreign Language: Pedagogical Implications of Iser's Reader-Response Theory. *Modern Language Journal* 73: 420–28.

Davis, James N., Lynn Carbón Gorell, Rebecca R. Kline, and Gloria Hsieh. 1992. Readers and Foreign Languages: A Survey of Undergraduate Attitudes toward the Study of Literature. *Modern Language Journal* 76:320–32.

Dawson, Laila M., and Albert C. Dawson. 2001. *Dicho y hecho: Beginning Spanish*. 6th ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dominicis, María Canteli, and John J. Reynolds. 1994. *Repase y escriba: Curso avanzado de gramática y composición*. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Esplugas, Celia, and Margarete Landwehr. 1996. The Use of Critical Thinking Skills in Literary Analysis. *Foreign Language Annals* 29: 449–61.

Fecteau, Monique L. 1999. First- and Second-Language Reading Comprehension of Literary Texts. *Modern Language Journal* 83: 475–93.

Fountain, Anne. 1996. Articulating Literature: Concerns and Considerations. *Hispania* 79(3): 539–42.

Frantzen, Diana. 1998. Focusing on Form While Conveying a Cultural Message. *Hispania* 81: 134–45.

Friedman, Edward H. 1992. Effective Stylistics; or, The Pressure of the Text: Foreign Literature and the Undergraduate. *ADFL Bulletin* 23(3): 18–22.

Garganigo, John F., René de Costa, Ben Heller, Alessandra Luiselli, Georgina Sabat de Rivers, and Elzbieta Sklodowska. 1997. *Huellas de las literaturas hispanoamericanas*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Graman, Tomas L. 1986. A Common Ground for Teachers of Language and Teachers of Literature: The Same Processes Toward Different Goals. *Hispania* 69: 177–79.

Harper, Sandra N. 1988. Strategies for Teaching Literature at the Undergraduate Level. *Modern Language Journal* 72: 402–08.

Henning, Sylvie D. 1993. The Integration of Language, Literature and Culture: Goals and Curricular Design. *ADFL Bulletin* 24(2): 51–55.

Hopper, Paul J., and Sandra Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56: 251–99.

James, Dorothy. 1996. Teaching Language and Literature: Equal Opportunity in the Inner-City University. *ADFL Bulletin* 28(1): 24–28.

Jordan, Isolde J. 1999. Análisis pragmalinguístico del diálogo literario. *Hispania* 82: 213–19.

Kauffmann, Ruth A. 1996. Writing to Read and Reading to Write: Teaching Literature in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 29: 396–402.

Keller, Betsy. 1997. Rereading Flaubert: Toward a Dialogue between First- and Second-Language Literature Teaching Practices. *PMLA* 112: 56–68.

Kern, Richard G. 1995. Redefining the Boundaries of Foreign Language Literacy. In *Redefining the Boundaries of Language Study*, edited by Claire Kramsch, 61–98. AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Knutson, Elizabeth M. 1997. Reading with a Purpose: Communicative Reading Tasks for the Foreign Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 30: 49–57.

Kramsch, Claire. 1985. Literary Texts in the Classroom: A Discourse. *Modern Language Journal* 69: 356–66.

_____, ed. 1995. *Redefining the Boundaries of Language Study*. AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Lalande, John F. 1988. Teaching Literature in the High School Foreign Language Class. *Foreign Language Annals* 21: 573–81.

Lee, James F. 1986. Findings and Implications of L2 Reading Research. *Hispania* 69: 181–87.

Lee, James F., and Diane Musumeci. 1988. On Hierarchies of Reading Skills and Text Types. *Modern Language Journal* 72: 173–87.

Lunn, Patricia V. 1985. The Aspectual Lens. *Hispanic Linguistics* 2: 49–61.

Lunn, Patricia Vining, and Janet A. DeCesaris. 1992. *Investigación de gramática*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Lunn, Patricia V., and Jane W. Albrecht. 1997. The Grammar of Technique: Inside "Continuidad de los parques." *Hispania* 80: 227–33.

Magnan, Sally Sieloff, Yvonne Rochette Ozzello, Laurey Martin-Berg, and William J. Berg. 1999. *Paroles*. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Martin, Anne. 1993. Student Views About the Contribution of Literary and Cultural Content to Language Learning at Intermediate Level. *Foreign Language Annals* 26: 188–207.

Mittman, Elizabeth. 1999. In Search of a Coherent Curriculum: Integrating the Third-Year Foreign Language Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 32: 480–93.

Mujica, Bárbara. 1996. *El próximo paso*. Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

_____. 1997. Teaching Literature: Canon, Controversy, and the Literary Anthology. *Hispania* 80: 203–15.

Nance, Kimberly A. 1994. Developing Students' Sense of Literature in the Introductory Foreign Language Literature Course. *ADFL Bulletin* 25(2): 23–29.

Noricks, Michael L. 1986. Introducing Literature: Some Points of Departure. *Hispania* 69: 709–10.

Omaggio Hadley, Alice. 1993. *Teaching Language in Context*. 2nd ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Rice, Donald B. 1991. Language Proficiency and Textual Theory: How the Twain Might Meet. *ADFL Bulletin* 22(3): 12–15.

Ruiz-Funes, Marcela. 1999. Writing, Reading, and Reading-to-Write in a Foreign Language: A Critical Review. *Foreign Language Annals* 32: 514–26.

Rulfo, Juan. 1953. No oyes ladrar los perros. *El llano en llamas*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

_____. 1955. *Pedro Páramo*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Schofer, Peter. 1990. Literature and Communicative Competence: A Springboard for the Development of Critical Thinking and Aesthetic Appreciation or Literature in the Land of Language. *Foreign Language Annals* 23: 325–34.

Shanahan, Daniel. 1997. Articulating the Relationship between Language, Literature, and Culture: Toward a New Agenda for Foreign Language Teaching and Research. *Modern Language Journal* 81: 164–74.

Shook, David J. 1996. Foreign Language Literature and the Beginning Learner-Reader. *Foreign Language Annals* 29: 201–16.

_____. 1997. Identifying and Overcoming Possible Mismatches in the Beginning Reader-Literary Text Interaction. *Hispania* 80: 234–43.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1983. Tense and Aspect in Oral Spanish Narrative: Context and Meaning. *Language* 59: 760–79.

Stockwell, Robert P., J. Donald Bowen, and John W. Martin. 1965. *The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Swaffar, Janet K. 1988. Readers, Texts, and Second Languages: The Interactive Processes. *Modern Language Journal* 72: 123–49.

Swaffar, Janet K., Katherine M. Arens, and Heidi Byrnes. 1991. *Reading for Meaning: An Integrated Approach to Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Vogely, Anita Jones. 1997. Introductory Spanish Literature Courses: An Instructional Model. *Hispania* 80: 244–54.

Widdowson, H. G. 1988. Aspects of the Relationship between Culture and Language. *Triangle* 7: 13–22.

FL027853

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").